



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,356	06/08/2000	Nobuhisa Yoda	016907/1095	9979

22428 7590 04/24/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,356

Applicant(s)

YODA ET AL

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 2/7/03.
2. Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7 are independent claims. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (specification, pages 2-3) in view of Barrett et al. ("Barrett", US 5,880,727).

As per claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art teaches an image processing system comprising an image reading device for reading an image an operation hierarchy of an operation screen of the image reading device wherein the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of said image reading device is set to have a correspondence relation with respect to the directory for recording the image of said file server (page 1, line 12 and 15; page 2, lines 6-22; *wherein an operation screen is inherent to the system in order to receive users' input*). Official Notice is given that hierarchical directories consisting of files in a hierarchical tree format are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a hierarchical directory to Applicant's admitted prior art so that with a cursory glance, users may view the tree view of the operation hierarchy and obtain what they are searching for more quickly. Furthermore, Applicant's admitted prior art teaches an image processing system comprising an image reading

device having an operation screen for reading images, a file server for recording the images from the image reading device on a directory and a plurality of client terminals connected to said file server via a communication line, for accessing the images recorded on the directory of the file server, and for commonly using the image reading device wherein the operation hierarchy of an operation screen of said image reading device is set to have a correspondence relation with respect to the directory for recording the image of said file server and changing point of the operation hierarchy reflect on the directory (page 1, line 12 and 15; page 2, lines 6-22). The modified teaching of Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly disclose an image processing system comprising an operation hierarchy and a directory hierarchy wherein contents of the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of the image reading device correspond to contents of the directory hierarchy for recording the images of the file server such that changing points of the operation hierarchy correspond to changing points of the directory hierarchy.

Barrett teaches an image processing system comprising an image reading device having an operation screen for reading images based on an operation hierarchy of the operation screen wherein contents of the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of the image reading device correspond to contents of the directory for recording the images such that changing points of the operation hierarchy correspond to changing points within the directory (figs. 4-5; col. 5, lines 21-59; *upon selecting an element such as "522", screen 50 of fig. 4 is replaced by the screen displayed in fig. 5 which reflects a different direction in the operation hierarchy*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Barrett's teaching of an image processing system comprising an image reading device having an operation screen for reading images based on an operation hierarchy of the operation screen wherein contents of

Art Unit: 2174

the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of the image reading device correspond to contents of the directory for recording the images such that changing points of the operation hierarchy correspond to changing points within the directory, to Applicant's admitted prior art wherein an image processing system comprising an image reading device having an operation screen for reading images, a file server for recording the images from the image reading device on a directory and a plurality of client terminals connected to said file server via a communication line, for accessing the images recorded on the directory of the file server, and for commonly using the image reading device wherein the operation hierarchy of an operation screen of said image reading device is set to have a correspondence relation with respect to the directory for recording the image of said file server and changing point of the operation hierarchy reflect on the directory in order to provide a more organized method of managing a directory in order of its corresponding contents of operation and also be consistent with the benefit(s) of having a hierarchical directory consisting of files in a hierarchical tree format wherein users viewing the tree view of the operation hierarchy may obtain what they are searching for quickly.

As per claim 2, Applicant's admitted prior art teaches an image processing system wherein the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of said image reading device is an operation screen of each hierarchy of said image reading device when a image is recorded on said file server (page 2, line 17 through page 3, line 2).

As per claim 3, the modified teaching of Applicant's admitted prior art and Barrett teaches an image processing system comprising contents of the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of the image reading device directly correspond to contents of the directory

Art Unit: 2174

hierarchy for recording the images of the file server (*i.e. directly correspond as in a one-to-one relationship wherein each operation screen is grouped according to function and saved in a separate file of the directory*) wherein when the image reading device changes the contents of the operation hierarchy of the operation screen, the contents of the directory hierarchy of the file server are inherently changed in accordance with the changed contents of the operation hierarchy, and when the client terminals change the contents of the directory hierarchy of the file server, the contents of the operation hierarchy of the operation screen of the image reading device are inherently changed in accordance with the changed contents of the directory hierarchy.

As per claim 4, the modified teaching of Applicant's admitted prior art and Barrett teaches the image processing system wherein an image-processing device function is accessible to a particular user (Applicant's admitted prior art: page 3, lines 1-2) and inherently comprising of an access limit assigned to the directory hierarchy of the file server for recording the image which corresponds to the preset operation hierarchy of the image reading device when an access limit of a user is assigned to either the operation screen of a preset operation hierarchy of the image reading device or a button displayed on the operation screen in order for the system to recognize the operation screen and allow users access to its directory.

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Barrett et al. ("Barrett", US 5,880,727) as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of Bladow et al. ("Bladow", US 6,115,040).

As per claim 5, the modified teaching of Applicant's admitted prior art and Barrett as recited in claim 4 teaches an image processing system wherein the access limit is made according to whether authorization is given based on an access limit. The teaching does not explicitly disclose an image processing system wherein the access limit is made according to whether authorization is given based on a log-in process using a user name and password. Bladow teaches a system providing a user interface for communicating with remote services, wherein access limit to the system is made according to whether authorization is made by a log-in process using a user name and password (col. 3, lines 30-36). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Bladow's system of utilizing user name and password to limit user's accessibility to the system, to the method of Applicant's admitted prior art and Barrett comprising limiting user's accessibility to the system to a particular user in order to insure that the user has valid access to the system and allow the user to access the system remotely.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Barrett et al. ("Barrett", US 5,880,727) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bladow et al. ("Bladow", US 6,115,040).

As per claim 6, the modified teaching of Applicant's admitted prior art and Barrett teaches an image processing system wherein an image-processing device function is accessible to a particular user (Applicant's admitted prior art: page 3, lines 1-2). The teaching does not explicitly disclose an image processing system wherein the access limit access limit of a user is a password number. Bladow teaches a system providing a user interface for communicating with remote services, wherein access limit to the system is made according to whether authorization is

Art Unit: 2174

made by a log-in process using a user name and password (col. 3, lines 30-36). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Bladow's system of utilizing a password number for limiting user's accessibility to the system, to the method of Applicant's admitted prior art and Barrett comprising limiting user's accessibility to the system according to a particular user in order to insure that the user has valid access to the system and allow the user to access the system remotely. Furthermore, the modified teaching of Applicant's admitted prior art, Barrett and Bladow does not explicitly disclose a password number wherein when an access limit of a user is set on either the operation screen of a preset operation hierarchy of the image reading device or a button displayed on the operation screen, a secret directory is automatically formed in the directory hierarchy of the file server corresponding to the preset operation hierarchy of the image reading device.

Official Notice is taken that such a feature of forming a secret directory having a name based on the password is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine this feature with the system of Applicant's admitted prior art, Barrett, and Bladow in order to allow new directories having a name based on the password number to be formed, or renaming existing directories having a name based on the password number to be formed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding contents of an operation hierarchy of an operation screen of an image reading device corresponding to contents of a directory hierarchy for recording the images of a file server, the Applicant argues that Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest that

Art Unit: 2174

the content of these hierarchies correspond to each other. However, the Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Applicant's admitted prior art discloses an operation hierarchy of an operation screen of an image reading device corresponding to a directory hierarchy for recording the image of a file server (page 2, lines 10-22).

Conclusion

8. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.13(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no even, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Inquires

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(703) 305-7601**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
April 12, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100